

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 18.94 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Executive Committee** was held on Monday, December 8, 2014 in Room 200 of the Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Chair Lund, Supervisor Buckley, Supervisor Vander Leest, Supervisor Moynihan, Supervisor Erickson, Supervisor Robinson (for Supervisor Evans)
Excused: Supervisor Evans, Supervisor Fewell
Also Present: Juliana Ruenzel, Brent Miller, Supervisor Van Dyck, Jeremy Kral, Dan Process, Supervisor Hoyer, Paul Srubas, Paul Van Noie, Jeff Oudeans, Supervisor Sieber, August Neverman, Troy Streckenbach, Chad Weininger, Supervisor Jamir, Maria Lasecki, Supervisor Kaster, Todd Vanden Heuvel, Beth Lemke, media, other interested parties

I. Call Meeting to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Tom Lund at 5:30 p.m.

II. Approve/modify agenda:

The agenda was modified to take Item 21 following Item 16 and delete Item 26.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve as modified. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III. Approve/modify Minutes of October 29, 2014.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Comments from the Public

-John Cermelli, N17W30200 Crooked Creek Road, Pewaukee, WI addressed the Committee. He stated that he represents the Brown County Sheriff's Department Non-Supervisory Labor Association and he thanked the Committee for allowing him to speak. He continued that he has worked diligently with Brent Miller and Juliana Ruenzel in bargaining and he wanted to summarize the unique proposal. He stated that the proposal is simple and will provide significant monetary savings to Brown County taxpayers. The proposal is that the bargaining unit will remove itself as a whole from the County's health insurance. The County and the employees will continue to pay the same percentage for health insurance that they pay now. The County will no longer be responsible for paying future retiree healthcare costs which will result in significant annual savings. The County would also no longer be responsible for paying future contributions to the health reimbursement account and the County would also no longer be responsible for paying UMR's fixed costs for 120 employees. The calculated savings are hard to tell because the contributions into the HRA are in flux, but Cermelli believes that conservatively this would show a \$200,000+ savings in the first year (2015) and similar savings in 2016.

Vacant Budgeted Positions (Request to Fill)

- 1. Child Support – Child Support Specialist-Enforcement (x2) - Vacated - 10/20/14; 12/8/14.**
- 2. Child Support – Clerk/Typist I - Vacated – 11/3/14.**

3. **Child Support – Intake Specialist - Vacated – 12/1/14.**
4. **Health Department – Public Sanitarian – Vacated – 12/19/14.**
5. **Human Resources – Safety Coordinator - Vacated – n/a.**
6. **Human Services – Economic Support Specialist - Vacated – 10/1/14.**
7. **Human Services – Office Manager II - Vacated – 9/24/14.**
8. **Human Services – Social Worker/Case Manager (Adult Protective Services) - Vacated – 11/3/14.**
9. **Human Services – Social Worker/Case Manager (Child Protection/Intake/Ongoing) - Vacated – 11/4/14.**
10. **Museum – Assistant Curator - Vacated 1/1/15.**
11. **Park Management – Park Ranger - Vacated – 11/28/14.**
12. **Planning & Land Services – Administrative Coordinator - Vacated 12/2/14.**
13. **Planning & Land Services – Administrative Secretary - Vacated 11/14/14.**
14. **Public Works Facilities – Facility Mechanic (x2) - Vacated – 12/16/14; 12/17/14.**
15. **Public Works Highway – Highway Laborer - Vacated – 10/24/14.**
16. **Public Safety Communications – Office Manager I – Vacated – 10/30/2014. *Referred back from November County Board.***

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to suspend the rules and take Items 1 through 16 together. Vote taken. Ayes: Moynihan, Erickson, Vander Leest, Robinson, Lund. Nay: Buckley MOTION CARRIED 5 - 1

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve Items 1 through 16. Vote taken. Ayes: Moynihan, Erickson, Vander Leest, Robinson, Lund. Nay: Buckley MOTION CARRIED 5 - 1

Although shown in the proper format here, Item 21 was taken at this time.

Communications

17. **Communication from Supervisor Sieber re: Ask all department heads to provide a report at every committee meeting detailing any open positions, the date they opened, the reason why they are open and when they are intended to be filled. *Referred from November County Board.***

Supervisor Sieber stated he was hoping to see a report regarding open positions included in reports of department heads at committee meetings. Sieber noted that he had spoken with Director of Administration Chad Weininger about this and he was informed that it would not be a problem to include this information at the bottom half of the budget status financial reports.

Erickson stated that he knows what Sieber is asking for and that this has also been asked for in the past. Erickson directed Sieber's attention to the agenda packet and noted that the information Sieber is seeking is contained in the packet, except for the fact that it has not come to committee. Erickson noted that these are already budgeted positions and therefore they do not go to committee. If these were to come to committee, it would take longer to have the position approved. In some cases, it could take up to three months to fill the positions.

Sieber responded that what he would like to see is a little bit different than what Erickson just described. He noted that he is not looking for approval of the positions; he is looking for information as to why people are leaving and things of that nature. He wants to know if positions are filled and if they are not filled, he wants to know why the positions are not filled, how long they have been open, etc. The information contained in the agenda packet does give

information as to why the positions are open and it certainly does not say what positions in the table of organization are open.

Supervisor Buckley stated that he has been advocating for changes in this process for a long time. He noted that there was recently an open position due to a retirement in Public Safety Communications. The Public Safety Committee never saw anything on the position and they had questions as to the job duties of the person. He noted that jobs change and job titles should be reviewed periodically to see that the title fits the duties. He felt that having the committees review the open positions was a good idea. He did not have any concerns with this slowing down the process of hiring new people, but he did feel that committees should be aware of what is happening with personnel in their departments.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to refer to staff to review proposal. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

18. Communication from Supervisor Sieber re: To work with Administration and develop a policy to expend the 1% pay for performance/merit pay. *Referred from November County Board.*

Sieber stated that the Board had allocated the funds for 1% merit pay but in talking with some department heads, there seems to be some confusion as to how that money is being administered. From what Sieber has been told, it was a maximum of 1% but not everybody was supposed to get the full 1%. He would like to see a committee of Supervisors formed to work with Administration and some department heads to find out how the merit pay is to be distributed. Sieber said that it seemed like some of the smaller departments would rather have the funds included in their pay rather than one lump sum in a bonus and he felt that department heads should have some flexibility with this. Sieber would like to see the department heads get the 1% for their department and use the pool of money as they see fit. They could use it for a piece of equipment that could make jobs easier and faster or things of that nature. He said the idea was to have the County Board have a little more input as to how the 1% is distributed instead of the way it is now.

Supervisor Vander Leest agreed with Sieber in that there should be more flexibility as to how this is administered. He felt that department heads should be able to reward their highest performers with a higher raise if they deem it appropriate. He stated that he has heard from department heads that they would also like to have more flexibility to reward the high performers.

County Executive Troy Streckenbach asked Vander Leest to define flexibility. Vander Leest responded that he would like department heads to be able to reward higher performers with more than the 1% bonus. Streckenbach stated that the directive administration received was not to go over 1% for any one employee. Sieber recalled when this was passed it was passed as a 1% without any directives. Sieber would like the Board and Administration to work to determine how it should be administered and have flexibility to go over 1% for an employee, but not to exceed the total overall for the department for the budget.

Human Resources Director Brent Miller stated that every department's plans for pay for performance was handed out to the Administration Committee for review and was included in the County Board minutes. He also noted that the Board's directive was not to exceed 1%. Streckenbach felt this should be brought back to Administration Committee and have further discussions. Streckenbach noted that there are different nuances in different departments as to how they operate. For example, if Child Support does not hit certain benchmarks they do not

get funding from the State. Streckenbach stated that he appreciated the idea of looking at more flexibility.

Supervisor Robinson stated that he would support sending this back to Administration, but he would be hesitant to give so much flexibility that the money could be spent on something other than pay. Lund also stated that he felt it should be kept at pay. Robinson would not like to see employees being pressured by their supervisors to agree to something that they might not really want to do.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to refer to Administration to develop a policy with the Human Resources Director to determine parameters for spending the 1% bonus and allow flexibility. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Supervisor Vander Leest was excused at 6:36 pm. Supervisor Van Dyck took his place at that time.

19. **Communication from Supervisor De Wane re: To create an ordinance for employee wage and benefits be sent to the Administration and Executive Committee in resolution format providing budget fiscal impact as well as employee financial impact no later than the July Meeting. Referred from November County Board.**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to hold for one month. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

20. **Communication from Supervisor Kaster re: Form a resolution that ends health insurance coverage for county retirees and for current county employees at the time of retirement. Referred from November County Board.**

Supervisor Kaster recalled that during the budget process there was a lot of discussion with regard to health insurance. Currently there are 83 retired employees who take the insurance. These retirees pay the full premium plus an administration fee, but these retirees are also turning in a lot of claims. Kaster stated that for every dollar paid in; about \$1.83 is being paid out. Miller provided information on this, copies of which are attached. Kaster stated a few years back the County did discontinue insurance coverage for retiree's spouses but what Kaster is looking at at this time is discontinuing insurance to retirees effective January, 2016. Right now the active employees are actually paying for the claims of the retired employees and this does not balance out. Kaster did not think the County could continue this way and he would like to see a resolution drawn up and voted on to the effect of ending insurance coverage for retired employees.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to refer to Corporation Counsel to draft an ordinance on health insurance coverage for retired County employees.

Van Dyck felt that this communication may have some merit, although it is hard to absorb it all with all the information provided in the handouts tonight. Van Dyck said that people need to realize that there may not have been any options in this regard a few years ago. With the Affordable Care Act being put into place now everybody has the opportunity to get some type of insurance. His opinion is that this may have been something that was needed in the past but is no longer necessary and he is in favor of taking a closer look at this. Miller stated that the reason this was put in place was due to union contracts.

Buckley asked how many of the people that are on this plan right now are being paid out of their bank of sick time. Miller referenced the handout and stated that out of the 83 people on this plan, eight of them are from the Sheriff's Department. For 2010 of the \$584,297 of medical claims, \$213,000 was for the Sheriff's Department. Further information is contained in the handout.

Buckley commented that if this benefit is no longer available to employees, there may be a cost in paying out employees for the sick days they have in escrow. For the average retiree this would be about \$45,000 and this keeps going up when there are raises given. Miller stated that one possible way to handle this is to pay it out which would cost about \$1.8 million dollars. Miller stated that one union last year proposed that it be paid out 70 cents on the dollar. Lund noted that once this is paid out, it would be gone.

Kaster stated that the retirees do pay both the employers' and the employees' share of the premium, along with the administrative fee, but it is still lopsided. Miller stated that this is the reason that other municipalities and school districts are getting out of this type of arrangement. Kaster stated that it was pondered at budget time how to cut costs and he felt that this is a pretty obvious way to do it. Lund agreed and stated that it is something that needs to be done and in light of the fact that there is now national health insurance, it is not like these retirees would be cut off completely.

Robinson felt that certainly the conversation needs to take place about money, and if there are ways to save money and make the health plan for the existing employees' healthier, he is for that. However, as far as the retirees, he understands that union contracts are not in place anymore, but it seems that they did make an agreement to make the insurance available to these people. Miller stated that he has spoken with Kaster about this and agreed that they would not cut off people that are currently on the plan. Kaster thought it would be appropriate to have this take effect in 2016 and moving forward, and anyone already on the insurance before then would be grandfathered in. Lund noted that people have to drop off the County insurance when they reach 65 years of age.

Robinson also cautioned that with regard to the exchanges under the Affordable Care Act, he was of the understanding that that is in question right now due to a case in the Supreme Court. If those subsidies go away, the economic model that the Affordable Care Act is built on would also go away. He noted that this likely will not happen right away, but he did feel that it will most likely crumble over time. For us to say to go get the healthcare on the health exchange is an open question and he hopes that part will be answered before decisions are made on this communication.

Erickson commented that Supervisor Kaster had mentioned that we had done this for the surviving spouses of former employees. It was done by giving a six month notice that the coverage option would be terminated. He stated that that could also be done in this instance with an effective date of January 1, 2016 but noted that if things would change in the meantime, it could be brought back for more discussion.

Motion by substitution made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to refer to staff and bring back at January meeting. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

21. **Communication from Supervisor Robinson re: That the County Board consider placing a referendum on the April 2015 election ballot asking the voters of Brown County if they would like to implement a .5% sales tax as allowed by state law, to be applied when the Stadium tax ends sometime in the latter half of 2015.**

Supervisor Robinson provided a handout, a copy of which is attached that outlines his proposal. He indicated that this information was also sent out to Supervisors via e-mail and is also included on his blog.

Robinson continued that this is a proposal for the County Board to consider a referendum on the sales tax. There are two key pieces: first, that the County Board consider this and second, that it is a referendum. Robinson said this is not asking, nor is he ready to endorse, a sales tax. He stated that he had three purposes in bringing this communication. First, to raise what he feels is an important question. Robinson noted that an estimated 30% of the money, maybe more than \$7 million dollars in 2013, comes from out of the county and this could have a significant impact on our county if the voters decide to take advantage of it. The second purpose was to do the due diligence that we consider important questions like this because Robinson believes that that was the job Supervisors are elected to do. The third purpose was to start a conversation in the community. If the Board is to do their due diligence, Robinson felt they have to start now and engage the community in this discussion and consideration.

The details of Robinson's proposal are outlined in the handout referenced above and are that the Community Investment Fund would be managed by an independent board appointed by the County Board, the County Executive and the municipalities in the County. Further, the sales tax revenue would not be spent until after the first year's tax is collected, so the Community Investment Fund Board would know exactly how much money it could allocate. Robinson also proposed that the tax should sunset 20 years after it is implemented. These details will be worked out if it is decided to move forward.

Robinson continued that he is personally not a fan of sales taxes as they tend to be regressive and disproportionately impact people of low income. This is why he is proposing that a portion of the Community Investment Fund be used for workforce development. He feels it is important to make sure that everyone in our community has the opportunity to provide for themselves and their families and this would give people the opportunity to develop the skills, knowledge and aptitude to find and keep a family supporting job. This would reduce dependency on government programs and would give companies and employers what they need most right now which is good employees willing to work.

Robinson continued that if the County Board decides to send a referendum to the voters and if the voters decide to approve it, he is proposing that one-quarter if it should go to workforce development and this would be a win - win for our community. By workforce development, Robinson means getting the workers of today ready for the jobs of today and also getting the workers of tomorrow ready for the jobs of tomorrow, making sure our children and youth are prepared for the future. Robinson wished to make it clear that he would not vote for a county sales tax unless the majority of the voters in a county-wide referendum supported it.

Robinson stated that he has heard from a number of people on this and so far it appears that the opinions are very evenly split with a very slight majority in favor of holding a referendum and/or having a sales tax. As a side note, Robinson spoke with an auditor at Schenck who audits 31 counties in the area. This auditor stated that of the 31 counties he audits, many have had

positive experiences with sales tax. This is not to say that Brown County should have one, but it is merely to stay that this is a question that is reasonable to consider.

With regard to the Community Investment Fund being managed by an independent board appointed by the County Board of Supervisors, the County Executive and the municipalities in the County, Vander Leest felt that fundamentally this would be the job of the County Board as elected officials rather than allowing non-elected people to make decisions with millions of dollars. With regard to the 20 year sunset clause, Vander Leest noted that the sales tax in place now has been in place since 2001 and he did a survey in the last election, both written and by asking people during his campaigning how they felt about the tax and he found that about 80% of the people wanted to end the sales tax, including those in neighborhoods near Lambeau Field. Vander Leest's fundamental opinion is to let people keep more of their own money. Taxing them more is not going to provide additional services that are not being provided at this time. He also felt that the 20 year period being proposed was much too long.

Vander Leest continued that the Taxpayers Alliance has done a study of counties who enacted a sales tax it was found that those counties ended up spending more and taxing more and he felt that this is a catalyst to spending more. Vander Leest's opinion was that this is not the right time as people would like to keep more in their own pockets, and he further does not think it is a good idea based on the feedback he has received.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to receive and place on file.

Erickson stated that he has received phone calls and e-mails regarding this and he has also had personal conversations with individuals on this. He noted that he did not have one conversation, phone call or e-mail where someone asked to have their taxes raised. Everyone he had contact with indicated they were not in favor of the ½% to continue. Reasons that were given include rising costs with utilities, water service and groceries, insurances of all types and insurance deductibles and prescription costs. Erickson said this tax would cost approximately \$200 per individual but he felt that with everything else going up in cost, another \$200 is something that an individual can use in other ways. Erickson also felt that Robinson was trying to rush this through. He felt that some breathing room would be appropriate after the current tax ends and he also felt that April was a foolish time to do this. He did not know who was up for election in April, but he did not feel that voter turnout would be high. He felt that if this does go to referendum it should be done during a Presidential election where there is a high percentage of people voting. He also stated that he would put this on as a question referendum to get an opinion and then work it out from there.

Buckley stated that it is amazing how many people are afraid to talk about the ½% tax that is currently in existence. He did not necessarily think that killing this communication was the right way to handle it, although he is not saying he agrees with the proposed breakdown of what should be done with the sales tax, but he did feel that this needs an honest discussion and he also felt it needs additional research. Buckley did think that it might be a little too soon for an April election and he felt that instead of pushing this under the rug and hoping it does not surface again, he felt it should be allowed to be sent back to find out how much money this involves and what can be done with it and come up with some ideas. He continued that if the goal is to represent the public, this should be taken to the public. He agreed with Vander Leest in that it is the Boards' responsibility to take care of the funds and the last thing he would want the funds do is to go into the general fund as that would be like putting it in a black hole.

Buckley continued that if the County was to have a ½% sales tax, he felt it needed to be run by a Board made up of different people within the County so the City cannot dominate where the money goes or the County cannot dominate where the money goes, but everyone has a stake in it. Buckley said that a huge chunk of the tax money comes from outside of Brown County and he felt that it was foolish to let that money walk away when it could be used for tax relief instead. Buckley also noted that there are problems with aging buildings in the county. He said that the county buys or builds buildings but then does not make a plan to take care of them. He also noted that there is debt that we continue to pay on or borrow more and he felt that this could be addressed as well. Buckley continued that there are a lot of things that could be addressed with this and if the county does not come up with some different ideas on how to sustain itself there will be problems. He felt that this proposed sales tax may be a way to do it, and it may not be, but he felt that it has to be looked at. He noted that Brown County has held the line on property taxes for the last four years and he felt that the Supervisors and staff have done a good job in operating leaner, but at some point in time there has to be other avenues that are explored. Buckley would like to see this referred to the Internal Auditor to come up with options and numbers. Buckley did not know all of the ins and outs and what the exact dollar amount is and he felt that the Auditor could come back with good information. He does not want to see this received and placed on file as people have to be open to at least look at it and make an educated decision and if at that point it is voted down, at least it would have been thoroughly looked at.

Erickson noted that there are 72 counties in Wisconsin and of those 72 counties, 62 of them have a ½% sales tax. The interesting part is that 46% of those counties have a higher mill rate on taxes than Brown County does. This shows that this is a quick fix to some degree that is paying for something, but in the future when something else is needed, taxes would have to be raised. This is what is happening in the other 46 counties and Erickson does not want to go down that road. He agrees that there are things that need to be taken care of and he referred to something Lund brought up in the past of having a surcharge for tickets sold at the Arena and Resch Center.

Moynihan stated that he understood what Buckley is talking about from the communication aspect and he felt that there may be merit on that. He stated that he seconded the motion to receive and place on file because when the proposal is stripped down, the Community Investment Fund being administered by another group, another bureaucracy and another layer of government is something he wholeheartedly disagrees with. He reminded those in attendance that in 2000 when the original vote was taken, it was a two part vote. The first part was for the stadium tax and the second vote was excess revenue from the sales tax be used for property tax relief purposes in Brown County and that was defeated at the polls. Moynihan felt that perhaps this communication would have merits if the proposal specified specific projects, sunset dates and things of that nature, but he is not supporting the proposal for a referendum at this time in its current form.

Supervisor Sieber thanked the Committee for allowing him to speak. He felt there were a lot of different ideas of what is going to happen, what should happen and what should not happen. He felt the best way to handle this would be to hold this until the next Executive Committee meeting and form a committee to collect ideas from the public as to what they would like to see. He referenced the referendums last spring for the pools in Howard and Ashwaubenon and these were broken down and he did not see any reason why an advisory referendum cannot be put together that says "would you support a half a percent sales tax" for different specific purposes. He does not think a general question would pass and he did not think there would be support for collecting the money and throwing it in a pot. Sieber felt that if there was a

breakdown of exactly what the proceeds would be used for, there would be a greater chance that people would get behind it.

Sieber continued that when he was out campaigning, he heard many opinions and ideas with regard to the sales tax. Sieber felt very comfortable with the decision he has made in his time on the Board, but this issue is something that has many opinions. There are a lot of people who do not like it, a lot who are in favor of it and a lot of people who want it for different reasons and Sieber felt that this is the perfect example of why we should have this on an advisory referendum. A referendum is not voting for the tax or supporting the tax, but is getting the opinion of the people for the tax. If it is defeated, obviously it would not go anywhere. Sieber would recommend sending this to a committee to gather thoughts, gather statistics and come up with different options and come forward at the next Executive Committee meeting with the thoughts from the public and other Supervisors and then decide if the Board wants to put it on as an advisory referendum.

Supervisor Kaster stated that he just went door to door campaigning for the Village Board for Bellevue and he brought the issue of the sales tax up and not one single person he talked to was in favor of continuing the tax and, in fact, there were a number of jokes made that the tax was never going away. Kaster recalled that there was a tax several years ago for the Arena that was only supposed to be around for a little while but is still in effect. Kaster continued that the only thing he would consider would be to adjust the sales tax whatever way and do away with the County portion of property taxes. Then you would really know that the tax is doing everyone good. He stated that the idea that a large part of the tax comes from outside the County is probably accurate, but it is still a tax and he has not talked to anyone who was in favor of it. He stated that when you have a referendum in the State to ask voters what the tax collected for the highways should be used on, it is pretty messed up and he is afraid that this would be the way this ends as well. Kaster continued that there are enough authorities and districts spending the taxpayers' money already and there is nothing anyone can do about it. Kaster did not feel we need another group spending tax money and deciding what to do with it when no one has anything to say about it. He is not in favor of this. He stated that he will take a stand on this and pull it on the County Board floor and shoot it down.

Supervisor Van Dyck said that when you talk about tax relief, he finds it interesting that we want to collect one tax to pay another tax. He is not sure if we feel that sales tax is regressive, why we would collect sales tax to provide property tax relief. He felt this was convoluted and it would make more sense to keep things the way they are. The other thing Van Dyck wished to point out is that it is nice to talk about debt relief and he understands the appeal for debt relief however the thought that this is going to save anything is ridiculous because he felt it was all going to get sucked right back up in the general fund and nobody is going to realize it is there. Van Dyck does not support this the way it is currently proposed and stated that unless something is put out that shows specifically what they are getting for the money they are spending, he does not agree.

Robinson stated people are critiquing certain points of the proposal and he felt that if he would have brought a proposal that says we should consider a referendum on a ½% sales tax people would have been up in arms. He would caution that we not get hung up too much on the details at this stage. He agreed with Buckley in that this is important enough that it needs further conversation. Robinson felt that to try to receive and place on file would be a mistake as it sends the message that it is dead and the County Board is not going to deal with it anymore. Moynihan pointed out that the communication could be pulled for discussion at the County Board.

Robinson continued that the phrase has been used about the ½% sales tax continuing. He noted that some of the people he had talked to were of the understanding that if the tax were to continue, it would continue to go to the Packers, but that is not true. The Packers tax is ending. If we had a sales tax, it would go to something else so when people say it is just continuing, it is not continuing for the same purpose and Robinson felt that people were confused on this. Robinson also addressed the concern of why to do this now. He stated that part of it is that it is hard on retailers to say they have the ½% now and we will get rid of it so we they will have to adjust their computers and then to have it put back in would be confusing for retailers. Robinson reiterated that we should not get hung up on the details right now. He put the details out because it references things such as a sunset clause, but if there are other ways to use this fund, that is fine with him. He liked the suggestion of Supervisor Sieber to put together a committee and he also liked Supervisor Buckley's suggestion to refer this to the Internal Auditor.

Robinson continued that Supervisor Erickson reported that 46 of the 62 counties that have a sales tax have a higher mill rate than Brown County. Robinson stated that he would be curious to know how the other counties stand and Erickson advised Robinson that he could get him a copy of the information he reviewed. With regard to the idea that different groups will get their hands on the proceeds, that is why the referendum would state what the tax is specifically for. It is not a matter of leaving it so ambiguous that anyone can get their hands on it. Robinson felt that on one hand we say the Supervisors as the County Board should be in charge of this and some have concerns about another body making decisions but at the same time we are saying we cannot trust ourselves to make sure that the money is kept track of. Robinson would like to think that the Board is responsible enough and have long-term memory enough to remember during the next budget season that we will be able to retain that particular piece of information.

In the end, Robinson wanted to make it clear that he is not saying that he felt we should have a sales tax. He is saying that he felt we should talk about a referendum and to kill it tonight would indicate that the Supervisors are not doing the job they were elected to do. He continued that there are serious concerns in this county that need to be addressed, from the buildings that have been mentioned to property tax relief and the workforce development he talked about, among other things. By not having conversations about these things that give the opportunity to talk about how to meet the challenges, the Supervisors are not doing their jobs. Robinson stated that all we are doing is talking about sending this to a referendum. He does not dispute what Supervisors have said they heard from their constituents, but he has not heard similar views. Robinson stated that he will vote against receiving and placing this on file and if this dies he would like to see what Supervisor Sieber and Supervisor Buckley proposed.

Moynihan pointed out again that this is not going to die tonight because it can be pulled from the report during the County Board meeting.

Vander Leest wished to point out that the Packers sales tax will end in September, 2015. What Robinson is proposing is a new tax and he does not understand why there would not be any property tax relief as part of it. Vander Leest reiterated that he will not support this and he stands by his motion to receive and place on file.

Buckley did not understand why people have a problem with the public having input on an advisory referendum as it is not binding. Moynihan suggested a communication be brought with something inclusive of citizens and Supervisors and form a committee aside of what is before us. Buckley felt that that may be an option and he also felt that an option would be to

send it to the Internal Auditor to be sure we are getting the information that is needed. He thinks killing this tonight sends the wrong message.

Van Dyck felt that voting this down is not killing it, but it is simply stating that you do not agree with the proposal that has been put forth. He gave Supervisor Robinson credit for bringing this forward, even though he does not agree with it and would not support it. He did not feel turning this over to the Internal Auditor was appropriate. The Board is elected to do a job and he felt that if a Supervisor has an idea or suggestion they should bring a proposal forward to be voted on.

Buckley stated that he would like to know the numbers of exactly what we have to work with. He continued that he would like to know how the funds could be used, what options need to be addressed with the County and how the numbers impact things such as property taxes.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Robinson to suspend the rules to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

-Robert Graf, 440 Howard Blvd., Apt 103, Green Bay, WI addressed the Committee. He stated he has heard all sorts of proposal and ideas during this discussion, but it was pretty simple and when this tax was voted in residents were promised that when the stadium was done the tax would end. Simple. That is all he understands and that is all anyone in his neighborhood understands. He does not care what other counties are doing and felt that the real point to the matter is that residents were promised the tax would come off when the stadium was complete. The stadium was complete about two years ago but since then they have done some more work. He recalled that when it was time to vote on this it did not look like it was going to go through and then an article came out that if the tax did not go through the Packers might be moving but he felt this was a bold faced lie and the City of Green Bay and Village of Ashwaubenon would never allow that to happen. He reiterated that they were promised that the tax would come off when the stadium was complete and Supervisors of the Board who were voted in by their districts should stick up for the constituents and do the jobs they were voted in to do and get rid of the tax.

-Dan Aude , 118 S. Washington Street, Green Bay, WI stated that he does support a referendum as this is a very important issue. He felt it was too important to not let the people have a say about how the County is funded going forward. He stated that there are less and less federal dollars and state dollars are less and less as well. Aude stated that another thing to consider is that as the gasoline tax goes away from a per gallon tax to a sales tax, according to research, the county can piggyback on all of those things that fall under sales tax. He stated that the numbers are quite large and he thanked Supervisor Robinson for bringing this forward. He realized that nobody likes to talk about raising taxes, but if we are honest with ourselves, this is something we need to look at.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Robinson to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

At this time the Committee went back to the original motion as follows:

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to receive and place on file. Vote taken. Ayes: Lund, Moynihan, Erickson, Vander Leest Nays: Robinson, Buckley. MOTION CARRIED 4 – 2

22. Communication from Supervisor Lund to show all committee actions on the County Board agenda.

Lund directed the Committee's attention to the example provided in the agenda packet that shows what the County Board agenda would look like to have all of the standing committee reports with the action items on it. Moynihan felt that this addresses somewhat of what Robinson spoke of earlier and it is not buried in a Committee report; all actions are there to see as part of the agenda.

Robinson thanked Lund for bringing this forward and trying to address some of the concerns he has and indicated that he will vote in favor of it, but noted that it does not address all concerns and he will continue to point out the fact that these things should be done in resolution form. Moynihan stated that he will continue to say to all standing committee chairman to put everything in the form of a resolution.

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Legal Bills

23. Review and Possible Action on Legal Bills to be paid.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Robinson to pay the bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Reports

24. County Executive Report.

County Executive Troy Streckenbach stated that he appreciated the work done for the County overall in addressing the County's concerns and he continues to look forward to working with the Board for the 2016 budget. He stated that if any Supervisors have any topics that they would like to see addressed in the 2016 budget to let him know as early as possible.

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

25. Internal Auditor Report.

a) Board of Supervisors Budget Status Report for October, 2014.

Motion made by Supervisor Robinson, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

b) Monthly Update – October/November, 2014.

Motion made by Supervisor Van Dyck, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- i. Discussion and possible action on the Final Internal Audit Report – Purchasing Function for Public Works Highway Department. *October 6th Motion: Hold until December meeting.***

Internal Auditor Dan Process indicated that he has received the responses from Paul Van Noie that were previously requested and he will be following up on this as he felt there could be some potential conflicts with some of the responses he received as far as whether the recommendations are being implemented. Process will follow up on this and he will provide an update at the January meeting.

Buckley asked when this audit was commenced and Process stated that the initiation letter was sent out in January. Process explained that he received responses from Van Noie in July, however, those responses did not address the recommendations that were made. Of the responses that Process received in November, there are two that raise some questions as to if the recommendations were fully addressed. Buckley asked why this process has taken so long and asked if Process made recommendations so significant that they could not be handled in a timely manner. Process stated that there was some pushback as to whether they needed to implement the recommendations. Process said in the original responses they tried to point out that there had not been any fraud or wrongdoing, but the recommendations addressed more that they need to strengthen internal controls to prevent those situations.

Buckley asked Van Noie why he is not working to get this cleared up. Buckley felt that this is trying to kick the can down the road. Van Noie responded that responses were made in June and July and Process responded that the most-recent responses were received in November, but they were backdated saying the recommendations were implemented July 1, however the first original responses did not indicate that. Van Noie stated he was not trying to kick this down the road to next year, but rather that they were effective July, 2014. Process responded that the most recent responses provided in November indicated that they were effective July 1. Process will go back and validate that as part of his quarterly review and validate that recommendations with that date have been implemented, but he noted that others have a timeframe of September 30, 2015. In some cases, the timeframe to get things implemented may be reasonable.

Buckley felt that a timeframe of September 30, 2015 is just kicking it down the road. He questioned why it would take until September 30, 2015 to implement the recommendations. Van Noie responded that there is a lot of work required to put together a procedures manual. He stated that they did the first piece and then left time open for the budget cycle and the second piece is to take place during the time following the end of the budget cycle until September 30, 2015. Buckley asked for specifics as to what was being extended until September 30. Process responded that the first one is the actual written procedures and this addresses the majority of the recommendations. Buckley asked Process to prioritize for the Highway Department what needs to be addressed and set out a timeline. Process responded that he can work with them on this. Process did say that it does take a long time to develop policies and procedures. Buckley just wanted to make sure that this moves forward and have monthly updates provided by both Process and Van Noie.

Erickson stated that this was sent back because it was not complete and then there was a recommendation for Corporation Counsel to make suggestions and that took time. Then it came back and was going to hit in October during budget time so it was moved back again. Erickson agreed with Process that some of these items take a long time. They are currently talking about two issues and he recommenced to Process that when he comes back in January that he only report on the two outstanding issues rather than the entire report.

Buckley goes back to when this was brought to the Executive Committee, and felt it seemed like it was being delayed since the beginning and he felt that had it been addressed in more prompt time it would have been done before the budget cycle.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Van Dyck to hold for one month. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

26. **Human Resources Report.**

- a) **Possible Amendment of the Code of Ordinances Section: 4.66 Vacation, Sub Paragraph 3: 4.66 VACATION. (1) All employees who are not covered by a bargaining agreement which includes a vacation schedule shall earn vacation as follows:**
(3) Employees must submit their vacation requests in advance and with as much notice as possible, so that supervisors can review the requests and make appropriate decisions based on the operational needs. In establishing regular schedules, supervisors shall give due consideration to the desires of individual employees within limits of work requirements of the division. Appointing authorities may amend vacation schedules to meet work emergencies or to grant requests of individual employees. If two or more employees request to take vacation during the same period and the matter cannot be resolved by agreement of the parties concerned, the employee with the most seniority with the County Department shall be granted vacation time. *October 6th Motion: To bring back at December meeting to allow Human Resources to make departments specific.*

This Item was stricken from the agenda.

Resolutions, Ordinances

27. **Resolution re: Change in Table of Organization for the Human Services Department (Drug Court Coordinator & Social Worker/Case Manager).**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Robinson to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

28. **Resolution re: Change in Table of Organization for the District Attorney's Office (LTE Legal Assistant I).**

Robinson noted that the fiscal note indicates that the resolution requires an appropriation of \$12,000. Lund stated that this would apply if the person elected to take the insurance and, if they do not, there would be a savings.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

29. **Resolution re: Change in Table of Organization for the Museum (Office Manager I & Technician – Research).**

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Van Dyck to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Open Session

30. **Discussion, strategy, possible action regarding: contract negotiations with the Non-Supervisory Deputy Sheriff's Labor Contract.**

No action taken.

Closed Session

31. Discussion, strategy, possible action regarding: contract negotiations with the Non-Supervisory Deputy Sheriff's Labor Contract. Closed session pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.85 (1)(e) Deliberating or negotiating the purchase of public properties, the investing of public funds or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session, and Wis. Stat. §19.85(1)(g) Conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved, and Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 111.70 as allowed for purposes of negotiating and collective bargaining, which authorizes the governmental body to convene in closed session.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Van Dyck to go into closed session. Roll call vote: Van Dyck, Buckley, Moynihan, Lund, Erickson, Robinson. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Van Dyke to return to open session. Roll call vote: Van Dyck, Buckley, Moynihan, Lund, Erickson, Robinson. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Reconvene in Open Session

32. Discussion, strategy, possible action regarding: contract negotiations with the Non-Supervisory Deputy Sheriff's Labor Contract.

No action taken.

Other

33. Such other matters as authorized by law.

None.

34. Adjourn.

Motion made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to adjourn at 7:27 p.m. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio
Recording Secretary

Here is the information you requested for the Sheriffs negotiations I pulled from the reports UMR sent.

- 1.) Number of Sheriff Retirees on our Insurance Plan Currently – 8
- 2.) Number in Escrow Accounts- 8
- 3.) Claims History for the Sheriffs Retirees –
 - 2010: \$213,641.62 OUT OF \$584,297.80 for the whole county
 - 2011: \$426,997.26 OUT OF \$758,472.77 for the whole county
 - 2012: \$480,886.21 OUT OF \$617,958.11 for the whole county
 - 2013: \$107,246.22 OUT OF \$640,128.50 for the whole county
 - 2014: \$3,345.52 OUT OF \$553,032.99 for the whole county YTD
- 4.) How long do the Sheriff Retirees Stay on our Insurance plans after retirement on average
Response from UMR: I'm not sure how we'd be able to track this...once they retire they would be moved to a retiree location and we would not know that they came from a Sherriff's designation.

I don't know why 2014 is so low, maybe because they don't have enough data yet in on claims filed for it to be accurate.

THIS IS MEDICAL CLAIMS ONLY!
NOT PRESCRIPTION DRUGS



Health Plan Performance Monitor Prepared for Brown County - Active Employees October 2014



I. REPORT PARAMETERS

A. Medical Administrator: UMR
B. Prescription Drug Administrator: Optum Rx
C. Reinsurance Carrier: BP, Inc.
D. Specific Stop-Loss Deductible: \$325,000

Employer Rates used for Calculating Health Premiums:
Single \$519.37
Family \$1,382.09

II. PLAN EXPERIENCE

Month	FIXED COST ANALYSIS				VARIABLE COST ANALYSIS				ENROLLMENT		TOTAL CONTRACTS
	Provider Network Fees	Administration	Stop Loss Premiums	TOTAL FIXED COSTS	Medical Paid Claims	Prescription Drug Costs	Paid Claims over Stop Loss Deductible	TOTAL VARIABLE COSTS	Single Contracts	Family Contracts	
January 2014	\$22,133	\$50,989	\$46,213	\$119,336	\$1,366,255	\$321,067	\$0	\$1,687,321	373	939	1,312
February 2014	\$22,167	\$51,067	\$46,112	\$119,346	\$1,021,193	\$216,652	\$0	\$1,237,844	380	934	1,314
March 2014	\$21,982	\$50,639	\$45,961	\$118,582	\$963,965	\$227,713	\$0	\$1,191,677	368	935	1,303
April 2014	\$22,066	\$50,834	\$46,095	\$118,995	\$915,406	\$255,613	\$0	\$1,171,019	371	937	1,308
May 2014	\$22,133	\$50,989	\$46,266	\$119,389	\$956,543	\$339,005	\$0	\$1,295,548	371	941	1,312
June 2014	\$22,218	\$51,183	\$46,294	\$119,695	\$900,231	\$224,874	\$0	\$1,125,105	378	939	1,317
July 2014	\$22,218	\$51,183	\$46,107	\$119,508	\$929,547	\$330,520	\$0	\$1,260,067	385	932	1,317
August 2014	\$22,218	\$51,183	\$46,081	\$119,482	\$961,260	\$236,653	\$0	\$1,197,913	386	931	1,317
September 2014	\$21,931	\$50,523	\$45,460	\$117,913	\$1,036,639	\$232,436	\$0	\$1,269,076	382	918	1,300
October 2014	\$22,066	\$50,834	\$45,749	\$118,648	\$973,976	\$351,622	\$0	\$1,325,599	384	924	1,308
November 2014											
December 2014											
TOTALS	\$221,132	\$509,423	\$460,339	\$1,190,894	\$10,025,015	\$2,736,155	\$0	\$12,761,170	3,778	9,330	13,108

III. KEY INDICATORS

Average Single Enrollment: 378
Average Family Enrollment: 933
Average Total Enrollment: 1,311

Total Plan Costs: \$13,952,064
Projected Plan Costs: \$14,857,080
Dollar Difference: \$905,016
Funding Loss Ratio: 94%

Fixed Costs per Employee per Year: \$1,090
Variable Costs per Employee per Year: \$11,682
Total Costs per Employee per Year: \$12,773

time off, he/she shall receive the additional time off with pay at another time mutually agreed upon by the employee and department. Should the funeral or internment occur at a delayed date (example: winter death, spring internment) the employee may use one (1) of the three(3) days to attend the funeral or internment. Compensation shall be at the regular hourly rate of said employee for a normal work day.

(2) Immediate family is defined as: wife, husband, father, mother, guardian, sister, and brother, child of employee, grandchildren, grandparents, father-in-law, mother-in-law, step-children, or stepparents.

(3) Employees will be entitled to compensation for one (1) day to attend the funeral of the spouse's grandparents or of a son-in-law or daughter-in-law, brother-in-law or sister-in-law, aunt or uncle of the employee or spouse. In the event an employee is required to act as a pallbearer at the funeral of someone outside of his/her immediate family, he/she shall be granted one (1) day off with bereavement pay.

(4) Should any death occur during an employee's vacation he/she shall receive additional time off with pay for any scheduled work day affected at a time mutually agreed upon by the employee and department.

(5) Department Heads shall consult with the Human Resources Director for any exceptions.

4.69 WORKER'S COMPENSATION. The County follows the requirements of state law.

4.70 INSURANCE.

(1) Health Insurance. The County will offer a group health insurance program for regular full-time and qualifying regular part-time employees. The employee and employer contributions toward the premiums of such plan together with the amount of deductible and the design of such plan shall be determined by the County on an annual basis.

(2) Dental Insurance. The County will offer a group dental insurance program for regular full-time and qualifying regular part-time employees. The employee and employer contributions toward the premiums of such plan together with the amount of deductible and the design of such plan shall be determined by the County on an annual basis.

(3) Life Insurance. The County will offer a group life insurance program for regular full-time and qualifying regular part-time employees. The employee and employer contributions toward the premiums of such plan together with the design of such plan shall be determined by the County on an annual basis.

➤ (4) Insurance Continuation. Employees who retire or receive disability benefits under the Wisconsin Retirement System, or those employees who become covered by social security for disability, or those who remain on the County long-term disability program, may continue to be covered at their own expense under the County's group hospital, dental and life insurance plans at the group rate until age sixty-five (65) by paying the appropriate premium amounts to the County.

13.05 Employee Information Changes. Any change in an employee's information (i.e., address, dependent status, wage rate, position transfer, etc.) shall be submitted to the Human Resource Department for processing.

SECTION 14 – BENEFITS ELIGIBILITY

14.01 Eligibility. All regular full-time employees are eligible for the following benefits unless stated otherwise. Regular part-time employees working fifty percent (50%) or more shall be eligible to receive fringe benefits on a pro-rated basis, unless stated otherwise.

14.02 Proration of Fringe Benefits in Final Year of Employment. Employees terminating their employment with Brown County shall have all fringe benefits prorated in their last year of employment.

SECTION 15 – INSURANCE

15.01 Policy. The County will offer a group health, dental, and life insurance programs for regular full-time and qualifying regular part-time employees. The employee and employer contributions toward the premiums of such plan shall be determined by the County on an annual basis. The County may change carriers from time to time, modify its insurance offerings, provide alternate insurance carriers, self-insure its insurance coverage or change benefit levels as it deems appropriate for any or all of its insurance coverage at its discretion. For complete plan coverage and information, see the summary plan description.

15.02 Eligibility. All regular employees are eligible for health and dental care coverage. New or rehired employees shall be covered on the first day of the month following the completion of thirty days of employment, provided the employee has completed an application.

- a) Regular part-time employees, working fifty percent or more shall be eligible for health, dental, and life insurance plans maintained by the County on a prorated basis. The percentage of employment which has been established by the budget or Board, shall determine the benefit pro-ration.

15.03 Payroll Deduction. Regular full-time and part-time employees will have their portion of the monthly premium deducted equally between two monthly payroll checks.

15.04 Termination of Coverage. In the case of an employee who terminates employment, coverage will be terminated on the last day of the terminating month.

15.05 Retiree Continuation Coverage. Those employees who retire under the Wisconsin Retirement System, or those employees who become covered by Social Security by disability and have been employed by Brown County ten (10) years or longer, may continue to be covered under the County's Health Plan at the group rate by making self-premium payments to the County. Dental plan benefits will terminate for each retiree/spouse upon the first of the month in which the retiree/spouse attains age 65.

15.06 COBRA Rights. Employees who are terminated from employment for reasons other than gross employee misconduct as well as employees who resign from their employment may continue their group health coverage for the period of time prescribed by COBRA. Spouses of deceased employees may continue with group health coverage for a period of time prescribed by COBRA. Such employees are normally advised of their continuation options and contribution requirements at the time of hire and at termination.

15.07 Life Insurance. All regular employees who are participants under the Wisconsin Retirement System may elect to become covered by life insurance through the Wisconsin Group Life Insurance Program. Eligibility for coverage is defined by the Wisconsin Group Life Insurance Program.

15.08 Vision Insurance. Employees may participate in a vision plan with the employee paying the full premium.

15.09 Deferred Compensation Plan. The County offers a Section 457 deferred compensation plan to eligible employees on a voluntary basis. Regular full-time and regular part-time employees are eligible to participate in the plan. Newly hired employees are eligible to participate in the plan immediately.

SECTION 16 – WISCONSIN RETIREMENT SYSTEM

16.01 Eligibility. Brown County is a participant in the Wisconsin Retirement System. All benefit questions must be handled through the WRS office directly.

- a) Full-time employees. Full-time employees shall be considered immediately eligible for participation in the Wisconsin Retirement System (WRS).
- b) Part-time employees. Are eligible if they are expected to work at least two-thirds of what is considered full-time employment by ETF. If, after one year, a part-time employee has worked at least two-thirds of what is considered full-time by ETF or at least 1,200 hours in the immediately preceding 12-month period, the part-time employee shall become a participating employee.

16.02 Employee Contribution. Once eligible for coverage under WRS, coverage is mandatory and an employee may not "opt out" of WRS. The County will make employer required WRS contributions as required by law. Employee contributions are pre-tax.

Proposal for a referendum on a County Sales Tax

That the County Board consider placing a referendum on the April 2015 election ballot asking the voters of Brown County if they would like to implement a .5% sales tax as allowed by state law, to be applied when the Stadium tax ends sometime in the latter half of 2015.

The revenue from such a tax would create a Community Investment Fund to be used in the following manner:

- One quarter for debt relief;
- One quarter for workforce development;
- One quarter for capital/infrastructure projects that reduce borrowing; and
- One quarter for economic development.

The Community Investment Fund would be managed by an independent board appointed by the County Board of Supervisors, the County Executive and the municipalities in the county. The sales tax revenue would not be spent until after the first year's tax is collected, so the Community Investment Fund Board would know exactly how much money it could allocate. The tax would also sunset twenty years after it is implemented.

The Community Investment Fund would reduce county debt, create more job opportunities, support local businesses, reduce dependence on government social service programs, and increase the quality of life in Brown County.